

**Cynthia L Rapp**

---

**From:** David Sanger [REDACTED] (b)(6)  
**Sent:** Friday, March 02, 2012 2:23 PM  
**To:** Cynthia L Rapp  
**Subject:** Re: \*\*\*\*Possible SPAM\*\*\*\* Just checking ....Fwd: Clarifying details on the Taliban bomb scare

Thanks. To your question, my guess is that the CIA's computers have, in a brilliant act of artificial intelligence, learned to take anything from NY Times reporters and immediately throw that label on it!

David

On Fri, Mar 2, 2012 at 2:20 PM, [REDACTED] wrote: (b)(3)

Hi David – I got it, and we're working it. Not to worry.

On your session with MM on the 12<sup>th</sup>, you are now on the calendar for 2-2:45. I will work to protect that.

BTW, why would your address trigger a spam alert? But that may explain some missing e-mails. Weird. Didi

---

**From:** David Sanger [REDACTED] (b)(6)  
**Sent:** Friday, March 02, 2012 2:15 PM  
**To:** Cynthia L Rapp  
**Subject:** \*\*\*\*Possible SPAM\*\*\*\* Just checking ....Fwd: Clarifying details on the Taliban bomb scare

Didi,

Since we've had a few emails go astray, I wanted to check you got this last night and that it's in process.

thanks,

David

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **David Sanger** [redacted]  
Date: Thu, Mar 1, 2012 at 6:15 PM  
Subject: Fwd: Clarifying details on the Taliban bomb scare  
To: [redacted]

(b)(6)

(b)(3)

Didi,

Here's the message with the Q's on the Taliban scare. If it's possible to get answers tomorrow, I can seal up that chapter and get it back to Random House, which is beating on my door. Thanks again.

David

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **David Sanger** [redacted]@nytimes.com>  
Date: Tue, Feb 21, 2012 at 6:00 PM  
Subject: Clarifying details on the Taliban bomb scare  
To: "Rhodes, Benjamin J." [redacted] "Viotor, Thomas F."

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Ben & Tommy,

I'm fact checking the several pages I've written about the scare in 2009 that the Taliban had obtained either a bomb or bomb-fuel, and I've run into some possible contradictions that I'm hoping you guys, or someone you consult, might clarify.

From the interviews I conducted, and our own discussions, I had the timing of this as the Fall of 2009, while the Afpak review is underway. But recently I came across Joby Warrick's "The Triple Agent," who discusses what seems to be a very similar set of events in May of the same year. In his account, the NSA picked up the phrase "itami" and a discussion of whether use of such a weapon was permissible under Islamic law. His account also links these events to Baitullah Mehsud's shura, and suggests that this is one of (many) reasons Mehsud was targeted. Are we discussing the same incident, or a different one?

That account also maintains that Jim Jones' trip to Islamabad on June 22 was related to this suspected problem, and the Pakistanis, while saying their own stockpiles were secure, said it was possible the Taliban were making a dirty bomb. That sound right? (I don't think we discussed a dirty-bomb possibility.)

This account does not contain two elements that I write about. One is that, at the President's orders, and with the Pakistani's approval, a bomb-search team -- they are called "render safe" teams -- was dispatched to the region. (Obviously, they didn't find anything.) The second is that the evidence suggests the Taliban got scammed.

So in summary, I have to figure out if I have the timing wrong, or if Joby does, and whether these other facts are correct. As we've discussed, it's a good-news story, because the cooperation with the Pakistanis worked out astoundingly well, and because it began regular consultations with Pakistan on nuclear issues that continued through the troubles of 2011. But I'd be grateful for the help -- the most important thing is that we get the facts straight.

cheers,

David

--

David E. Sanger | Chief Washington Correspondent | *The New York Times*

Phone: [redacted] [@nytimes.com](mailto:[redacted]@nytimes.com)

(b)(6)

--

David E. Sanger | Chief Washington Correspondent | *The New York Times*

Phone: [redacted] [@nytimes.com](mailto:[redacted]@nytimes.com)

(b)(6)